arXiv:1603.00645v3 [math.PR] 2 Nov 2016

A spatial model for selection and cooperation

Peter Czuppon, Peter Pfaffelhuber

November 3, 2016

Abstract

We study the evolution of cooperation in an interacting particle system with two types. The model we investigate is an extension of a two-type biased voter model. One type (called defector) has a (positive) bias α with respect to the other type (called cooperator). However, a cooperator helps a neighbor (either defector or cooperator) to reproduce at rate γ. We prove that the one-dimensional nearest-neighbor interacting dynamical system exhibits a phase transition at $\alpha = \gamma$. A special choice of interaction kernels yield that for $\alpha > \gamma$ cooperators always die out, but if $\gamma > \alpha$, cooperation is the winning strategy.

Keywords: Interacting particle system; voter model; cooperation; phase transition; extinction; survival; clustering
AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 60K35; Secondary 82C22, 92D15

1 Introduction

In nature cooperative behavior amongst individuals is widely spread. It is observed in animals, e.g. [Clu09, GW03], as well as in microorganisms, e.g. [Cre01, WL06]. In the attempt to understand this phenomenon by models, theoretical approaches introduced different interpretations and forms of cooperation, mostly within the area of game theory [Now06]. In all such approaches, a defector (or selfish) type tends to have more offspring, but there are cases when it is outcompeted by the cooperator type under some circumstances. Although in all of the models describing cooperation the question of extinction and survival of a type or the coexistence of several types are main subjects of the mathematical analysis, the frameworks for the theoretical studies may vary. While (stochastic) differential equations are mainly used for non-spatial systems (see for example [AS12, HJM15+]), the theory of interacting particle systems provides a suitable setup for the analysis of models with local interactions between the particles, [BK11, EL16, SS15]. In this paper we define a model using the latter structure and terminology.

Investigations of models incorporating cooperation are interesting because of the following dichotomy: in non-spatial (well-mixed) situations, the whole population benefits from the cooperative behavior. If defectors have a higher fitness than cooperators, defectors always outcompete cooperators in the long run. However, if the system is truly spatial, cooperators can form clusters and then use their cooperative behavior in order to defend themselves against defectors, even though those might have higher (individual) fitness. This heuristics suggests that only structured models can help to understand cooperative behavior in nature. For the model studied in the present paper, we will make it precise in Proposition 2.6 for

extinction of cooperators in a non-spatial system and in Theorem 1 for extinction of defectors in a spatial system, if cooperation is strong enough.

Due to the variety of interpretations of cooperative behavior there are different ways of implementing these mechanisms in a spatial context. In the field of population dynamics, Sturm and Swart [SS15] study an interacting particle system containing a cooperative-branching mechanism which can be understood as a sexual reproduction event. In [BK11], Blath and Kurt study a branching-annihilating random walk and again, a cooperation mechanism is interpreted as sexual reproduction. In contrast, the model introduced by Evilsizor and Lanchier in [EL16] originates from the game-theoretical study of a two player game with different strategies where the strategies can be altruistic or selfish. Here, the altruistic strategies represent the cooperator type. We discuss the findings of these models to our results in Section 4.

Various interacting particle systems which appear in the literature are attractive, i.e. two versions of the system, which start in configurations where one dominates the other, can be coupled such that this property holds for all times; see e.g. [SS15] for an attractive model mentioned above. For such processes, there exist several general results (cf. [Lig85]) which provide some useful techniques helping in the analysis. However, cooperation often leads to non-attractive interacting particle systems; see [BK11, EL16] and the one presented here. The reason here is that cooperators (or altruists) do not distinguish between non-cooperators and their own type which usually contradicts attractiveness.

The motivation for the present paper came from studies of bacterial cells in the context of public-good-dilemmas, e.g. [BBRG08, DNSWB14]. The idea is that there are two types (defector=0, cooperator=1), where only cooperators produce some public good which helps neighboring cells to reproduce. However, this production is costly which means that defectors will have a selective advantage over the cooperator type. The resulting model is a biased voter model with an additional cooperation mechanism. The main objective of our paper is to study the long-time behavior of such a model dependent on the parameters of the system.

In particular, we prove for our main model in one dimension from Definition 2.5.3, that the system clusters independently of the parameter configuration. When starting in a translation invariant configuration, for $\alpha > \gamma$, defectors take over the population, whereas for $\gamma > \alpha$ cooperators win; see Theorem 1. Additionally, in higher dimensions, at least we can show that the parameter region where defecting particles win is larger than for $d = 1$; see Theorem 2. We also show that a finite number of cooperators dies out if $\alpha > \gamma$, but may survive if $\gamma > \alpha$. The converse holds true for defectors; see Theorem 3. What remains to be seen is if there are parameter combinations such that cooperators win also in higher dimensions. Some preliminary results in the limit of small parameters α and γ or very large γ can be found in [Czu16].

The paper is structured as follows. First, we give a general definition of the model in Section 2. After the definition we derive some properties of the model, show its existence and consider some special cases and related systems. In Section 3 we state limit results for the main model and its derivatives, mainly restricted to the one-dimensional lattice. Subsequently, in Section 4, we compare our results with those obtained in similar models, e.g. from [BK11] and [EL16]. The rest of the paper is devoted to the proofs of the theorems.

2 The model and first results

2.1 The model

Let V be a countable vertex set, and $(a(u,v))_{u,v\in V}$ be a (not necessarily symmetric) Markov kernel from V to V. Additionally, $(b(u,(v,w))_{u\in V,(v,w)\in V\times V}$ is a second Markov kernel from V to $V\times V$. We study an interacting particle system $X=((X_t(u))_{u\in V})_{t\geq 0}$ with state space $\{0,1\}^V$, where $X_t(u)\in\{0,1\}$ is the type at site u at time t. A particle in state 0 is called *defector* and a particle in state 1 is called *cooperator*. The dynamics of the interacting particle system, which is a Markov process, is (informally) as follows: For some $\alpha,\gamma\geq 0$:

- *Reproduction:* A particle at site $u\in V$ reproduces with rate $a(u,v)$ to site v, i.e. $X(v)$ changes to $X(u)$. (This mechanism is well-known from the voter model.)
- *Selection:* If $X(u)=0$ (i.e. there is a *defector* at site $u\in V$), it reproduces with additional rate $\alpha\ a(u,v)$ to site v, i.e. $X(v)$ changes to 0. (A defector has a fitness advantage over the cooperators by this additional chance to reproduce. This mechanism is well-known from the biased voter model.)
- *Cooperation:* If $X(u)=1$ (i.e. there is a *cooperator* at site $u\in V$), the individual at site v (no matter which state it has) reproduces to site w at rate $\gamma\ b(u,(v,w))\geq 0$. (A cooperator at site u helps an individual at site v to reproduce to site w.)

Remark 2.1 (Interpretation)**.** 1. *Selection:* Since cooperation imposes an energetic cost on cooperators, the non-cooperating individuals can use these free resources for reproduction processes. This leads to a fitness advantage which we describe with the parameter α.

2. *Cooperation:* The idea of the cooperation mechanism in our model is that each cooperator supports a neighboring individual, independent of its type, to reproduce to another site according to the Markov kernel b. A biological interpretation for this supportive interaction is a common good produced by cooperators and released to the environment helping the colony to expand. The corresponding interaction parameter is γ.
   Below, we will deal with two situations, depending on whether $b(u,(v,u))>0$ or $b(u,(v,u))=0$. In the former case, we speak of an altruistic system, since a cooperator at site u can help the particle at site v to kill it. In the latter case, we speak of a cooperative system.

In order to uniquely define a Markov process, we will need the following assumption.

Assumption 2.2 (Markov kernels)**.** The Markov kernels $a(.,.)$ and $b(.,(.,.))$ satisfy

$$\sum_{u\in V} a(u,v)<\infty \text{ for all } v\in V \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\sum_{u,v\in V} b(u,(v,w))<\infty \text{ for all } w\in V. \tag{2.2}$$

Remark 2.3 (Some special cases)**.** A special case is

$$b(u,(v,w)) = a(u,v)\cdot a(v,w) \quad \text{for all } u,v,w \in V. \tag{2.3}$$

Then, (2.2) is implied by the assumption

$$\sup_{v\in V}\sum_{u\in V} a(u,v) < \infty,$$

which is stronger than (2.1). We will also deal with a similar case setting $b(u,(v,u)) = 0$ which means that u cannot help v to replace u. To be more precise, we set

$$b(u,(v,w)) = \begin{cases} a(u,v)\cdot \frac{a(v,w)\mathbb{1}_{\{w\neq u\}}}{\sum_{w'\neq u} a(v,w')}, & \text{if } a(v,u) < 1, \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \qquad \text{for all } u,v,w \in V. \tag{2.4}$$

The normalizing sum in the denominator emerges from the exclusion of self-replacement, i.e. (2.4) is the two-step transition kernel of a self-avoiding random walk.

2.2 Existence and uniqueness of the process

We now become more formal and define the (pre-)generator of the process X via its transition rates. Given $X \in \{0,1\}^V$, the rate of change $c(u,X)$ from X to

$$X^u(v) = \begin{cases} X(v), & v \in V\backslash\{u\}; \\ 1 - X(u), & v = u; \end{cases}$$

is as follows:
If $X(u) = 0$, then

$$c(u,X) = \sum_v a(v,u)X(v) + \gamma \sum_v X(v)\sum_w X(w)b(w,(v,u)). \tag{2.5}$$

If $X(u) = 1$, then

$$c(u,X) = (1+\alpha)\sum_v a(v,u)(1-X(v)) + \gamma\sum_v (1-X(v))\sum_w X(w)b(w,(v,u)). \tag{2.6}$$

Here, the first sum in $c(u,X)$ represents the rates triggered by reproduction and selection whereas the last terms emerge from the cooperation mechanism.

The existence of a unique Markov process corresponding to the transition rates $c(u,X)$ satisfying Assumption 2.2 is guaranteed by standard theory, see for example [Lig85, Chapter 1]. Precisely, we define the *(pre-)generator* Ω of the process through

$$(\Omega f)(X) = \sum_{u\in G} c(u,X)(f(X^u) - f(X)),$$

where $f \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$, the domain of Ω, is given by

$$\mathcal{D}(\Omega) := \{f : \{0,1\}^V \to \mathbb{R} \text{ depends only on finitely many coordinates}\}.$$

We note that $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ is dense in $C_b(\{0,1\}^V)$, the set of bounded continuous functions on $\{0,1\}^V$, because of the Stone-Weierstrass-Theorem. We find the following general statement.

Proposition 2.4 (Existence of unique Markov process)**.** *If Assumption 2.2 holds, the transition rates* $c(.,.)$ *given in* (2.5) *and* (2.6) *define a unique Markov process* X *on* $\{0,1\}^V$*. Moreover, the closure* $\bar{\Omega}$ *of* Ω *is the generator of* X*.*

Proof. We need to show that the closure of Ω in $C(\{0,1\}^V)$ is a generator of a semi-group which then uniquely defines a Markov process (see for example [Lig85, Theorem 1.1.5]). In order to show this we follow [Lig85, Theorem 1.3.9] and check the following two conditions:

$$\sup_{u\in V}\sup_{X\in\{0,1\}^V} c(u,X) < \infty, \tag{2.7}$$

$$\sup_{u\in V}\sum_{v\neq u}\widetilde{c}_u(v) < \infty, \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$\widetilde{c}_u(v) := \sup\{\|c(u,X_1) - c(u,X_2)\|_T : X_1(w) = X_2(w) \text{ for all } w \neq v\}$$

measures the dependence of the transition rate $c(u,X)$ of the site $v \in V$ and $\|\cdot\|_T$ denotes the total variation norm.

Both inequalities follow from Assumption 2.2 and the definition of the transition rates $c(.,.)$. Using these we obtain for any $X \in \{0,1\}^V$ and $u \in V$

$$c(u,X) \leq (1+\alpha)\sum_{v\in V} a(v,u) + \gamma \sum_{v,w\in V} b(w,(v,u)) < \infty$$

showing (2.7). For (2.8), we note that $\widetilde{c}_u(v) \neq 0$ only when either $a(v,u) > 0$ or $b(w,(v,u)) > 0$ or $b(v,(w,u)) > 0$ for some $w \in V$. Hence, for all $u \in V$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v\neq u}\widetilde{c}_u(v) &\leq \sum_{v\neq u}\left((1+\alpha)a(v,u) + \gamma\sum_{w\in V} b(w,(v,u)) + b(v,(w,u))\right)\\ &\leq \sum_{v\in V}(1+\alpha)a(v,u) + 2\gamma\sum_{v,w\in V} b(v,(w,u)) < \infty,\end{aligned}$$

where we used the inequalities (2.1) and (2.2) again and we have proved (2.8).

Now, using [Lig85, Theorem 1.3.9] we see that the closure of Ω in $C(\{0,1\}^V)$ is a Markov generator of a Markov semigroup. This finishes the proof. □

We can now define the voter model with bias and cooperation.

Definition 2.5 ((Cooperative/Altruistic) Voter Model with Bias and Cooperation)**.** *Let* $a(.,.)$ *be a Markov kernel from* V *to* V *satisfying* (2.1) *and* $b(.,(.,.))$ *be a Markov kernel from* V *to* $V \times V$ *satisfying* (2.2)*.*

1. *The (unique) Markov process with transition rates given by* (2.5) *and* (2.6) *is called the* Voter Model with Bias and Cooperation *(VMBC).*

2. *If* (2.3) *holds, the VMBC is called the* altruistic Voter Model with Bias and Cooperation *(aVMBC).*

3. *If* (2.4) *holds, the VMBC is called the* cooperative Voter Model with Bias and Cooperation *(cVMBC).*

2.3 Unstructured populations

As a first result, we show that the probability for cooperators to die out on a large, complete graph tends to one (for $\alpha > 0$). We consider the special case of an *unstructured population*. Therefore, let V^N be the vertex set of a graph with $|V^N| = N$ and

$$a^N(u,v) = \frac{1}{N-1}$$

for $u, v \in V^N$ with $u \neq v$. Due to the global neighborhood it is equally likely to find configurations of the form "101" and "110". Hence, cooperation events favoring a defector or a cooperator happen with the same rate and thus cancel out when looking at the mean field behavior of the system. We will show that defectors always take over the system for large N. It can easily be seen that the aVMBC is dominated by the cVMBC, so it suffices to show extinction of cooperators for the cVMBC, i.e. we have

$$b^N(u,(v,w)) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{u\neq v\}}}{N-1}\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{v\neq w\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{w\neq u\}}}{(N-1)\frac{N-2}{N-1}} = \frac{1}{(N-1)(N-2)}\mathbb{1}_{\{u,v,w \text{ different}\}}.$$

We prove that in the limit for large N the frequency of cooperators follows a logistic equation with negative drift, hence cooperators die out. See also [EK86, Chapter 11].

Proposition 2.6 (Convergence in the unstructured case)**.** *Let X^N be a cVMBC on V^N and $S^N := \frac{1}{N}\sum_u X^N(u)$ the frequency of cooperators. Then, if $S_0^N \xrightarrow{N\to\infty} s_0$, then*

$$S^N \xrightarrow{N\to\infty} S,$$

where S solves the ODE

$$dS = -\alpha S(1-S)$$

with $S_0 = s_0$, independently of γ.

Proof. In order to prove the limiting behavior for $N \to \infty$, we observe that S^N is a Markov process. A calculation of the generator Ω^N applied to some smooth function f yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega^N f(s) = {} & Ns\frac{1-s}{1-\frac{1}{N}}(f(s+\tfrac{1}{N}) - f(s)) + (1+\alpha)N(1-s)\frac{s}{1-\frac{1}{N}}(f(s-\tfrac{1}{N}) - f(s)) \\ & + \gamma Ns\frac{s-\frac{1}{N}}{1-\frac{1}{N}}\frac{1-s}{1-\frac{2}{N}}(f(s+\tfrac{1}{N}) - f(s)) \\ & + \gamma Ns\frac{1-s}{1-\frac{1}{N}}\frac{s-\frac{1}{N}}{1-\frac{2}{N}}(f(s-\tfrac{1}{N}) - f(s)) \\ \xrightarrow{N\to\infty} {} & -\alpha s(1-s)f'(s).\end{aligned}$$

Applying standard weak convergence results, see for example [EK86, Theorem 4.8.2], this shows the claimed convergence. □

3 Results on the long-time behavior for $V = \mathbb{Z}^d$

Our main goal is to derive the long-time behavior of the VMBC with $V = \mathbb{Z}^d$. In spin-flip systems, results on the ergodic behavior can be obtained by general principles if the process is *attractive*. Thereby, a spin-system is called attractive if for two configurations $X, Y \in \{0,1\}^V$ with $X \leq Y$ componentwise, the corresponding transition rates c satisfy the following two relations for all $u \in V$

$$X(u) = Y(u) = 0 \Rightarrow c(u, X) \leq c(u, Y), \tag{3.1}$$

$$X(u) = Y(u) = 1 \Rightarrow c(u, X) \geq c(u, Y). \tag{3.2}$$

However, the VMBC is not attractive for $\gamma > 0$. Indeed, consider the simple case when $V = \{u, v, w\}$ with Markov kernels

$$a(u, v) = a(v, w) = a(w, u) = 1$$

and $b(u, (v, w)) = a(u, v)a(v, w)$. Then, let $X = (001)$ and $Y = (101)$ (i.e. $X(u) = 0, Y(u) = 1, X(v) = Y(v) = 0, X(w) = Y(w) = 1$) and note that $X \leq Y$, but

$$c(w, X) = 1 + \alpha < 1 + \alpha + \gamma = c(w, Y).$$

This shows that (3.2) is not satisfied at $w \in V$. Hence, proofs for the long-time behavior require other strategies which do not rely on attractiveness of the process.
Before we state our main results we define what we mean by extinction and clustering.

Definition 3.1 (Extinction, clustering). *1. We say that in the VMBC-process $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ type $i \in \{0,1\}$* dies out *if*

$$P\left(\lim_{t\to\infty} X_t(u) = 1 - i\right) = 1, \quad \textit{for all } u \in V.$$

2. We say that the VMBC-process clusters *if for all $u, v \in V$*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} P(X_t(u) = X_t(v)) = 1.$$

We will use $V = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and nearest neighbor interaction via the kernels a and b. In this case we have that for all $u, v, w \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $|u - v| = |w - v| = 1$

$$a(u, v) = \frac{1}{2d}, \qquad b(u, (v, w)) = \frac{1}{(2d)^2} \tag{3.3}$$

for the aVMBC and

$$a(u, v) = \frac{1}{2d}, \qquad b(u, (v, w)) = \frac{1}{2d(2d-1)} \mathbb{1}_{\{u \neq w\}} \tag{3.4}$$

for the cVMBC. We say that (the distribution of) a $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$-valued random configuration X is *non-trivial* if $P(X(u) = 0 \text{ for all } u), P(X(u) = 1 \text{ for all } u) < 1$. Furthermore, we call X *translation invariant* if $(X(u_1), ..., X(u_n)) \stackrel{d}{=} (X(u_1 + v), ..., X(u_n + v))$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, u_1, ..., u_n, v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. If the VMBC model is started in a translation invariant configuration $X_0 \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, the configuration X_t is translation invariant due to the homogeneous model dynamics.

Now we can state our main results. For cVMBC, we distinguish between the case $\alpha > \gamma$ where we can state a convergence result in all dimensions $d \geq 1$, the case $\gamma > \alpha$ and the case $\gamma = \alpha$. In the last two cases, the method of proof is only applicable in dimension $d = 1$.



Figure 1: Relative frequencies of cooperators after $100,000$ transitions of the cVMBC on a $1,000$ sites torus in one dimension (dashed line), a 40×40 sites torus in two dimensions (solid line) and a $12 \times 12 \times 12$ sites torus in three dimensions (dotted line). The initial configuration was a Bernoulli-product measure with probability 0.5 and the selection rate α was set to 0.5. We suspect that the slightly smaller slope in three dimensions is a finite-number effect.

Theorem 1 (cVMBC-limits)**.** *Let $V = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $a(.,.)$ be the nearest neighbor random walk kernel and X be the cVMBC with $\alpha, \gamma \geq 0$ starting in some non-trivial translation invariant configuration.*

(i) If $d \geq 1$ and $\alpha > \gamma$, the cooperators die out.

(ii) If $d = 1$ and $\gamma > \alpha$, the defectors die out.

(iii) If $d = 1$ and $\gamma = \alpha$, the process clusters.

The proof of Theorem 1 can be found in Section 6.1. Briefly, for $\alpha > \gamma$, we will use a comparison argument with a biased voter model, see Definition 5.1. For $\gamma > \alpha$ and $d = 1$, however, we prove the convergence result with the help of a clustersize-process which takes the special form of a one-dimensional jump process. As we will see, for $\gamma > \alpha$, a cluster of cooperators has a positive probability to survive and expand to infinity which will then yield the result. Unfortunately, due to the simple description of such a cluster in one dimension, this argument cannot be extended to higher dimensions. However, resorting to some simulation results for $d = 2$ and $d = 3$, we see a similar behavior (with a different threshold) like in $d = 1$, see Figure 1. For higher dimensions, spatial correlations between sites are weaker reducing the impact of clusters on the evolution of the system. This in turn leads to a reduced chance of survival of cooperators.
For the aVMBC, we can only state a threshold when cooperators die out.

Theorem 2 (aVMBC-limits)**.** *Let $V = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $a(.,.)$ be the nearest neighbor random walk kernel and X be the aVMBC with $\alpha, \gamma \geq 0$ starting in some non-trivial translation invariant configuration.*

(i) If $d \geq 1$ and $\alpha > \gamma \frac{d-1}{d}$, the cooperators die out. In particular, for $d = 1$, the cooperators die out if $\alpha > 0$ independently of γ.

(ii) If $d = 1$, the process equals the cVMBC with parameters $\alpha+\gamma/2$ and $\gamma/2$ in distribution. In particular, if $\gamma > \alpha = 0$, the process clusters.

The proof of the Theorem can be found in Section 6.2. Again, for $\alpha > \gamma(d-1)/d$, we can use a comparison argument with the biased voter model. However, it remains an open question whether cooperators in the aVMBC have a positive probability of survival in any dimension. On the one hand, the difference between the aVMBC and the cVMBC becomes smaller in high dimensions suggesting survival of cooperators for large γ. On the other hand, clustering is usually more difficult in higher dimensions but cooperators can only survive due to clustering. First simulation results for $d = 2$ and $d = 3$ show that survival of cooperators is unlikely in the aVMBC.

Remark 3.2 (Cooperation only among cooperators)**.** Another cooperation mechanism we might consider arises if cooperators only help other cooperators, i.e. the cells recognize related cells. In ecological literature this behavior is called kin-recognition or kin-discrimination, see [PF10] for an overview. As to the theoretical behavior of the model this changes the transition rate in (2.6), i.e. if $X(u) = 1$ then

$$c(u, X) = (1 + \alpha) \sum_v a(v, u)(1 - X(v)).$$

Here, cooperators are less likely to die and hence, this process dominates the cVMBC. In particular, for translation invariant initial conditions, defectors die out for $\gamma > \alpha$ in one dimension. Moreover, as can be seen from a calculation similar as in the proof of Lemma 5.3, a biased voter model, where type 0 is favored, still dominates this process for $\alpha > \gamma$. Hence, we also have that cooperators die out in this case and the same results as in Theorem 1 hold.

Since cooperators always die out in $d = 1$ for the aVMBC (as long as $\alpha > 0$), we focus on the cVMBC in the sequel. We state some results if the starting configuration is not translation invariant, but contains only a finite number of cooperators or defectors.

Theorem 3 (Finite initial configurations)**.** *Let $V = \mathbb{Z}$ and $a(.,.)$ be the nearest neighbor random walk kernel and X be the cVMBC with $\alpha, \gamma \geq 0$. Let X_0 contain either finitely many defectors or finitely many cooperators (i.e. $X_0 = \mathbb{1}_A$ or $X_0 = 1 - \mathbb{1}_A$ for some finite $A \subseteq V$).*

(i) The process clusters.

(ii) If $\alpha \geq \gamma$ and X_0 contains finitely many cooperators, the cooperators die out.

(iii) If $\gamma \geq \alpha$ and X_0 contains finitely many defectors, the defectors die out.

Remark 3.3 (Starting with a single particle)**.** A particularly simple initial condition is given if $|A| = 1$. In case there is initially only a single cooperator, we note that the size of the cluster of cooperators $(C_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a birth-death process which jumps from C to

$$\begin{aligned} &C + 1 \text{ at rate } \mathbb{1}_{\{C>0\}} + \gamma \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{C\geq 2\}}, \\ &C - 1 \text{ at rate } (1 + \alpha) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{C>0\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, if there is only a single defector, the size of the cluster of defectors $(D_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a birth-death process which jumps from D to

$$\begin{aligned} &D + 1 \text{ at rate } (1 + \alpha) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{D>0\}} + \gamma \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{D=1\}}, \\ &D - 1 \text{ at rate } (1 + \gamma) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{D>0\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, either cooperators or defectors die out, depending on whether $(C_t)_{t\geq 0}$ (or $(D_t)_{t\geq 0}$) hits 0 or not.

The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Section 6.3. Note that the only situations where the process does not converge to a deterministic configuration in this setting are the cases where $\gamma > \alpha$ ($\alpha > \gamma$) and the process starts with finitely many cooperators (defectors). Here, the limit distribution is a linear combination of the invariant measures $\delta_{\underline{0}}$ and $\delta_{\underline{1}}$, the all-zero and all-one configuration, respectively. This basically means that we observe clustering, which is statement (i) above.

4 Comparison to results from [BK11] and [EL16]

In this section we compare our results on the cVMBC to those obtained by Blath and Kurt in [BK11] and the system introduced by Evilsizor and Lanchier in [EL16]. We choose these two models since both have mechanisms favoring one type, while a second type is only favored if it occurs in a cluster.

Comparison to [BK11]

One model studied is the cooperative caring double-branching annihilating random walk (ccD-BARW) on the integer lattice $\mathbb{Z}$. Particles migrate to neighboring sites with rate m and annihilate when meeting another particle. (Note that this mechanism favors the unoccupied state.) The double-branching events happen with rate $1 - m$. Here, the authors restrict branching to particles with an occupied neighboring site and such particles branch to the next unoccupied site to the left and to the right. (That is, if a cluster of size ≥ 2 already exists, the branching mechanism extends the cluster.) Their result about this process, starting in a finite configuration (see Theorem 2.4 in the paper), states that for $m < 1/2$, particles survive with positive probability, whereas for $m > 2/3$, particles die out almost surely.

Although Blath and Kurt only discuss the case of a finite initial configuration, the results are in line with our findings: If the mechanism to favor enlargement of existing clusters (cooperation in our case and cooperative branching in their case) is too weak, type 0 (or the unoccupied state) wins. Importantly, in both models, enlargement of existing clusters can be strong enough in order to outcompete the beneficial (or unoccupied) type.

Comparison to [EL16]

The model studied in [EL16] – called the death-birth updating process – emerges from a game theoretic model with two strategies. This means that transition rates are derived from a 2×2 payoff-matrix with entries a_{ij} for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ representing the payoff obtained by a particle of type i due to interacting with a particle of type j. Now, a particle dies with rate 1 and is replaced by a particle in its neighborhood proportionally to its fitness which is determined by the values of the payoff-matrix. The neighborhood is given by blocks of radius R. The authors analyze this model in different settings. They call a strategy i selfish if $a_{ii} > a_{ji}$ for $j \neq i$ (i.e. the payoff having strategy i as opponent is bigger if one has the same strategy i) and altruistic if $a_{ii} < a_{ji}$. Again, in a non-spatial version of this game, selfish strategies always outcompete altruistic strategies. Noting that selfish strategies seem to be fitter, altruistic strategies might become favorable if they form a big cluster because altruists might have a high payoff. As

the results in [EL16] show (see their Figure 2), there are parameter regions – in particular in a spatial Prisoner's dilemma – where altruists can outcompete selfish strategies.

Clearly, the cVMBC is a much simpler model than the death-birth updating process. This is resembled in the results, since [EL16] show parameter combinations with coexistence for the death-birth updating process, but our results never show coexistence for the cVMBC. However, as in our findings for the cVMBC, [EL16] find that types unfavorable in a non-spatial context can indeed win in all dimensions. Unfortunately, they can only give bounds on the phase transition in their model, while we have seen that $\alpha = \gamma$ is a sharp threshold, at least in one dimension.

5 Preliminaries

Here we provide some useful results for the proofs of our theorems. In particular, we provide a comparison with a biased voter model in Section 5.1 and a particular jump process in Section 5.2.

5.1 Comparison results

In cases where $\alpha > \gamma$, it is possible to prove a stochastic domination of the VMBC by a biased voter model. The precise statements will be given below. But first, we define this process, which was introduced by Williams and Bjerknes in [WB71] and first studied by Bramson and Griffeath in [BG81].

Definition 5.1 (Biased Voter Model)**.** *The biased voter model with bias $\beta \geq -1$ and $\delta \geq -1$ is a spin system $\widetilde{X}$ with state space $\{0,1\}^V$ and transition rates as follows:*
If $\widetilde{X}(u) = 0$, then

$$\widetilde{c}(u, \widetilde{X}) = (1+\beta) \sum_v a(v,u) X(v).$$

If $\widetilde{X}(u) = 1$, then

$$\widetilde{c}(u, \widetilde{X}) = (1+\delta) \sum_v a(v,u)(1 - X(v))$$

Remark 5.2 (Long-time behavior of the biased voter model)**.** The long-time behavior of the biased voter model is quite simple. In [BG81], the limit behavior of the biased voter model in $V = \mathbb{Z}^d$ with nearest neighbor interactions is studied. Generalizations to the case of $d-$regular trees for $d \geq 3$ can be found in [LTV14]. We restate the results for $V = \mathbb{Z}^d$:
Let $\widetilde{X}$ be a biased voter model with bias $\beta > -1$ and $\delta > -1$ as introduced in Definition 5.1. For any configuration $X_0 \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ with infinitely particles of each type it holds that the type with less bias dies out, i.e.:

1. If $\beta > \delta$, type 0 dies out (i.e. $P(\lim_{t\to\infty} \widetilde{X}_t(u) = 1) = 1$ for all $u \in V$).
2. If $\delta > \beta$, type 1 dies out (i.e. $P(\lim_{t\to\infty} \widetilde{X}_t(u) = 0) = 1$ for all $u \in V$).

Lemma 5.3 (cVMBC$\leq$biased voter model)**.** *Let X be a cVMBC with bias α and cooperation coefficient γ and $\widetilde{X}$ a biased voter model with bias γ and α. Then, if $b(.,(.,.))$ satisfies $\sum_u b(u,(v,w)) \leq a(v,w)$, and $X_0 \leq \widetilde{X}_0$, it is possible to couple X and $\widetilde{X}$ such that $X_t \leq \widetilde{X}_t$ for all $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. We need to show (see [Lig85, Theorem 3.1.5]) that for $X \leq \widetilde{X}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{if } X(u) = \widetilde{X}(u) = 0, \quad \text{then } c(u, X) \leq \widetilde{c}(u, \widetilde{X}), \\ &\text{if } X(u) = \widetilde{X}(u) = 1, \quad \text{then } c(x, X) \geq \widetilde{c}(u, \widetilde{X}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

We start with the first assertion and write

$$\begin{aligned} c(u, X) &= \sum_v a(v, u) X(v) + \gamma \sum_v X(v) \sum_w X(w) b(w, (v, u)) \\ &\leq \sum_v a(v, u) X(v) + \gamma \sum_v X(v) a(v, u) \\ &\leq (1 + \gamma) \sum_v a(v, u) \widetilde{X}(v) = \widetilde{c}(u, \widetilde{X}), \end{aligned}$$

and for the second inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} c(u, X) &= (1 + \alpha) \sum_v a(v, u)(1 - X(v)) + \gamma \sum_v (1 - X(v)) \sum_{w,v} X(w) b(w, (v, u)) \\ &\geq (1 + \alpha) \sum_v a(v, u)(1 - X(v)) \geq (1 + \alpha) \sum_v a(v, u)(1 - \widetilde{X}(v)) = \widetilde{c}(u, \widetilde{X}). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. □

Next, we focus on the aVMBC in the case $V = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and the symmetric, nearest-neighbor random walk kernel.

Lemma 5.4 (aVMBC≤biased voter model)**.** *Let $V = \mathbb{Z}^d$, $a(.,.)$ be the nearest-neighbor random walk kernel defined in equation* (3.3)*, X be an aVMBC with bias α and cooperation coefficient γ and $\widetilde{X}$ a biased voter model with bias $\gamma(2d-1)/(2d)$ and $\alpha + \gamma/(2d)$. Then, if $X_0 \leq \widetilde{X}_0$, it is possible to couple X and $\widetilde{X}$ such that $X_t \leq \widetilde{X}_t$ for all $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. Again, we need to show that for $X \leq \widetilde{X}$ the inequalities in (5.1) hold. We start with the first assertion and write by using that $X(u) = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} c(u, X) &= \sum_v a(v, u) X(v) + \gamma \sum_v X(v) \sum_w X(w) a(v, w) a(v, u) \\ &\leq \sum_v a(v, u) X(v) + \gamma \sum_v X(v) a(v, u) \sum_{w \neq u} a(v, w) \\ &\leq \Big(1 + \gamma \frac{2d - 1}{2d}\Big) \sum_v a(v, u) \widetilde{X}(v) = \widetilde{c}(u, \widetilde{X}), \end{aligned}$$

and for the second inequality, now using $X(u) = 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} c(u, X) &= (1 + \alpha) \sum_v a(v, u)(1 - X(v)) + \gamma \sum_v (1 - X(v)) \sum_w X(w) a(w, v) a(v, u) \\ &\geq (1 + \alpha) \sum_v a(v, u)(1 - X(v)) + \gamma \sum_v (1 - X(v)) a(u, v) a(v, u) \\ &= \Big(1 + \alpha + \frac{\gamma}{2d}\Big) \sum_v a(v, u)(1 - X(v)) \\ &\geq \Big(1 + \alpha + \frac{\gamma}{2d}\Big) \sum_v a(v, u)(1 - \widetilde{X}(v)) = \widetilde{c}(u, \widetilde{X}). \end{aligned}$$

This yields the statement. □

5.2 A result on a jump process

In the proof of Theorem 1, we will use the dynamics of the size of a cluster of cooperators and rely on a comparison of this clustersize process with a certain jump process (which jumps downward by at most one and upwards by at most two). The following Proposition will be needed.

Proposition 5.5 (A jump process)**.** *Let $(\mu(t))_{t\geq 0}, (\lambda_1(t))_{t\geq 0}, (\lambda_2(t))_{t\geq 0}$ be $\mathbb{R}_+$-valued càdlàg-stochastic processes, adapted to some filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$, which satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(t) + 2\lambda_2(t) - \mu(t) > \varepsilon > 0 \text{ for some } \varepsilon \text{ and} \\ \lambda_1(t) + \lambda_2(t) + \mu(t) < C \text{ for some } C > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

In addition, let $(C_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a $\mathbb{Z}$-valued $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$-Markov-jump-process, which jumps at time t from x to

$$\begin{aligned} x-1 \text{ at rate } \mu(t), \\ x+1 \text{ at rate } \lambda_1(t), \\ x+2 \text{ at rate } \lambda_2(t) \end{aligned}$$

Then,

1. *$C_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} \infty$ almost surely and*
2. *$P(T_1 = \infty) > 0$, for $C_0 = 2$ and $T_1 := \inf\{t : C_t = 1\}$.*

Proof. In the case of time-homogeneous rates, i.e. constant μ, λ_1 and λ_2, the assertion is an immediate consequence of the law of large numbers. We prove the general case by using martingale theory. We assume without loss of generality that $\lambda_1(t) + \lambda_2(t) + \mu(t) = 1$ for all $t \geq 0$. (Otherwise, we use a time-rescaling. Note that this rescaling is bounded by assumption (5.2) and therefore, $C_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} \infty$ holds iff it holds for the rescaled process.)

We first show that there exists $a_c > 0$ such that for all $a \in (0, a_c)$, the process $(\exp(-aC_t))_{t\geq 0}$ is a positive $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$-super-martingale. For this, consider the (time-dependent) generator of the process $(C_t)_{t\geq 0}$ applied to the function $f(x) = \exp(-ax)$ which yields at time t

$$\begin{aligned} (G_t^{\mathcal{C}} f)(x) &= \lambda_1(t)\exp(-a(x+1)) + \lambda_2(t)\exp(-a(x+2)) \\ &\qquad + \mu(t)\exp(-a(x-1)) - \exp(-ax) \\ &= \exp(-ax)(\lambda_1(t)\exp(-a) + \lambda_2(t)\exp(-2a) + \mu(t)\exp(a) - 1) \\ &= \exp(-ax) g_t(a) \end{aligned}$$

for $g_t(a) := \lambda_1(t)\exp(-a) + \lambda_2(t)\exp(-2a) + \mu(t)\exp(a) - 1$. Noting that for all t, we have that $g_t(0) = 0$ and

$$\frac{\partial g_t}{\partial a}(0) = -\lambda_1(t) - 2\lambda_2(t) + \mu(t) < -\varepsilon$$

by (5.2), we find $a_c > 0$ such that $g_t(a) < 0$ for all $0 < a < a_c$ and all $t \geq 0$, which means that $(\exp(-aC_t))_{t\geq 0}$ is an $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$-super-martingale. By the martingale convergence theorem, it converges almost surely and – since the sum of rates is bounded away from 0 – the only possible almost sure limit is 0. Now, 1. follows since $C_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} \infty$ if and only if $\exp(-aC_t) \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0$

for some $a > 0$. For 2., the process $(\exp(-aC_{t\wedge T_1}))_{t\geq 0}$ is a non-negative supermartingale by Optional Stopping. Let us assume that $T_1 < \infty$ almost surely, which occurs if and only if $C_{t\wedge T_1} \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 1$ almost surely. Then, using the Optional Stopping Theorem, we obtain with $C_0 = 2$

$$\begin{aligned}\exp(-2a) = E[\exp(-aC_0)] &\geq \lim_{t\to\infty} E[\exp(-aC_{t\wedge T_1})] \\ &= E[\lim_{t\to\infty} \exp(-aC_{t\wedge T_1})] = \exp(-a),\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction since $a > 0$. Thus, we have that $P(T_1 = \infty) > 0$. □

6 Proofs

Here, we will show our main results.

6.1 Proof of Theorem 1

For (i), we have $\alpha > \gamma$. The assertion is a consequence of the coupling with the biased voter model from Lemma 5.3 (with bias γ and α). Since the biased voter model dominates the cVMBC and type 1 dies out in the biased voter model (5.2), the same is true for the cVMBC.

The proof of (ii) is more involved. We have to show that cooperators survive almost surely when started in a non-trivial translation invariant configuration. Therefore, we analyze an arbitrary cluster of cooperators and show that the size of such a cluster has a positive probability to diverge off to infinity. Note that the flanking regions of a cluster of cooperators can have three different forms:

Case A	Case B	Case C
$00\underbrace{1\ldots1}_{\text{cluster of cooperators}}00,$	$10\underbrace{1\ldots1}_{\text{cluster of cooperators}}01,$	$00\underbrace{1\ldots1}_{\text{cluster of cooperators}}01$ or $10\underbrace{1\ldots1}_{\text{cluster of cooperators}}00$

These are the only possible environments a cluster of cooperators can encounter in one dimension. Note that a cluster can also only consist of a single cooperator. The dynamics of the cluster size depends on the environment. Precisely, by the dynamics of the process, we obtain the following. A cluster of size $x > 1$

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{in case A jumps to } y = x+1 \text{ at rate } 1+\gamma \\ &\qquad\text{jumps to } y = x-1 \text{ at rate } 1+\alpha \\ &\text{in case B jumps to } y \geq x+2 \text{ at rate at least } 2+\gamma \\ &\qquad\text{jumps to } y = x-1 \text{ at rate } 1+\alpha+\gamma \\ &\text{in case C jumps to } y \geq x+2 \text{ at rate at least } 1+\tfrac{\gamma}{2} \\ &\qquad\text{jumps to } y = x+1 \text{ at rate } \tfrac{1+\gamma}{2} \\ &\qquad\text{jumps to } y = x-1 \text{ at rate } 1+\alpha+\tfrac{\gamma}{2}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, let $(V_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a stochastic process representing the cluster of cooperators which is closest to the origin and contains at least two cooperators. (If

there is no such cluster at time 0, wait for some time $\varepsilon > 0$ and pick the cluster then.) We will show that

$$P(V_t \uparrow \mathbb{Z}) > 0. \tag{6.2}$$

For this, we compare $|V| = (|V_t|)_{t\geq 0}$ with a jump process $(\widetilde{V}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ as in Corollary **??**, where the jump rates at times t are given as follows:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{in case A} & \lambda_1(t) = 1+\gamma, & \lambda_2(t) = 0, \qquad \mu(t) = 1+\alpha; \\ \text{in case B} & \lambda_1(t) = 0, & \lambda_2(t) = 2+\gamma, \quad \mu(t) = 1+\alpha+\gamma; \\ \text{in case C} & \lambda_1(t) = \dfrac{1+\gamma}{2}, & \lambda_2(t) = 1+\dfrac{\gamma}{2}, \quad \mu(t) = 1+\alpha+\dfrac{\gamma}{2}. \end{array}$$

Moreover, this process is stopped when reaching 1. By the comparison in (6.1), we see that we can couple $|V|$ and $\widetilde{V}$ such that $\widetilde{V} \leq |V|$, at least until $\widetilde{V}$ reaches 1. Since the jump rates of $\widetilde{V}$ indeed satisfy $2\lambda_2(t) + \lambda_1(t) - \mu(t) > \varepsilon > 0$ for all times $t \geq 0$ we find $\widetilde{V}_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} \infty$ with positive probability which implies that $P(|V_t| \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} \infty) > 0$ holds as well. Still, we need to make sure that the cluster does not wander to $\pm\infty$. For this, consider both boundaries of the cluster if it has grown to a large extent. The right boundary is again bounded from below by a jump process of the form as in Corollary **??** with $\lambda_1(t) = \frac{1+\gamma}{2}, 0;\ \lambda_2(t) = 0, 1+\frac{\gamma}{2}$ and $\mu(t) = \frac{1+\alpha}{2}, \frac{1+\alpha+\gamma}{2}$ for the cases A and B (note that the right boundary alone of case C is already captured by the right boundaries of the cases A and B). So, again, we see from Corollary **??** that the right border of the cluster goes to infinity with positive probability. The same holds for the left border of the cluster which tends to $-\infty$. Therefore, we have shown (6.2).

Now we use (6.2) to show that defectors indeed go extinct. Note that, from the argument given above, the probability of survival of a cluster of cooperators depends on the environment, but is bounded away from 0 by some $p > 0$. We start at time 0 with a cluster of cooperators which has at least probability p to survive as proved above. In case it survives we are done, otherwise it goes extinct in finite time and has at most merged with finitely many other cooperating clusters until then. Thus, at this extinction time we can choose another cluster of cooperators which exists due to the translation invariance of the starting configuration. This cluster again has a probability of survival of at least p independently of the history of the interacting particle system. This allows for a Borel-Cantelli-argument showing that when repeating these steps arbitrarily often eventually one of the cooperating clusters survives. This happens at the latest after a geometrically distributed number of attempts and thus in finite time. Hence, we have $P(\lim_{t\to\infty} X_t(u) = 1) = 1$ for all u and we are done.

For (iii), in order to prove clustering in the case $\alpha = \gamma > 0$, there are actually two proofs. One relies on the dual lattice and the study of process of cluster interfaces, which performs annihilating random walks. This technique would even show clustering for all parameters α and γ. However, we show clustering by studying the probability of finding a cluster edge in the special case $\alpha = \gamma$. Clustering for the other parameter configurations was already shown in (i) and (ii) since extinction also implies clustering of the process.

For our method, we write $p_t(i_0 \cdots i_k) := P(X_t(0) = i_0, \cdots X_t(k) = i_k)$ for $i_0, ..., i_k \in \{0, 1\}$ and $k = 0, 1, 2, ...$ We have to show that

$$p_t(10) \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0, \qquad p_t(01) \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0 \tag{6.3}$$

since then – by translation invariance – every configuration carrying both types has vanishing probability for $t \to \infty$.

We start with the dynamics of $p_t(1)$, which reads (recall that $\alpha = \gamma$)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial p_t(1)}{\partial t} &= \frac{1}{2}(p_t(10) + p_t(01)) + \frac{\gamma}{2}(p_t(110) + p_t(011)) \\ &\qquad - \frac{1+\alpha}{2}(p_t(10) + p_t(01)) - \gamma p_t(101) \\ &= -\frac{\alpha}{2}(p_t(10) + p_t(01)) + \frac{\gamma}{2}(p_t(10) + p_t(01) - 2p_t(010)) - \gamma p_t(101) \\ &= -\gamma(p_t(101) + p_t(010)) \leq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Since $p_t(1) \in [0,1]$, this probability has to converge for $t \to \infty$, hence $\frac{\partial p_t(1)}{\partial t} \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0$, and therefore

$$p_t(101) \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0, \qquad p_t(010) \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0. \tag{6.4}$$

Now, consider the dynamics of $p_t(11)$, which is

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial p_t(11)}{\partial t} &= p_t(101) + \frac{\gamma}{2}(p_t(1101) + p_t(1011)) \\ &\qquad - \frac{1+\alpha}{2}(p_t(110) + p_t(011)) - \frac{\gamma}{2}(p_t(1011) + p_t(1101)) \\ &= p_t(101) - \frac{1+\alpha}{2}(p_t(110) + p_t(011)).\end{aligned}$$

Since we know that $p_t(101) \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0$ by (6.4), and because $p_t(11) \in [0,1]$, we also have that

$$p_t(110) \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0, \qquad p_t(011) \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0.$$

We now conclude with

$$\begin{aligned}p_t(10) = p_t(010) + p_t(110) &\xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0, \\ p_t(01) = p_t(010) + p_t(011) &\xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0,\end{aligned}$$

which shows (6.3). □

6.2 Proof of Theorem 2

(i) We use the comparison with the biased voter model from Lemma 5.4. Therefore, we have that $\alpha > \gamma(d-1)/d$ if and only if $\alpha + \gamma/(2d) > \gamma(2d-1)/(2d)$. Since for this choice of parameters type 1 goes extinct in the biased voter model which dominates the aVMBC, we are done.

(ii) For $d = 1$ and the nearest neighbor random walk, the altruistic mechanism is such that a configuration 01 (or 10) turns into 00 at rate $\alpha/2 + \gamma/4$. The same holds for the cVMBC with selection rate $\alpha + \gamma/2$. In addition, 110 (or 011) turns to 111 at rate $\gamma/2$, which is the same as for the cVMBC with cooperation parameter γ. This shows that the transition rates for the altruistic process $\widetilde{X}$ satisfy:

If $\widetilde{X}(u) = 0$, then

$$c(u, \widetilde{X}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{v:|v-u|=1} \widetilde{X}(v) + \frac{\gamma}{4}\sum_{v:|v-u|=1} \widetilde{X}(v) \sum_{\substack{w:|w-v|=1 \\ w\neq u}} \widetilde{X}(w).$$

If $\widetilde{X}(u) = 1$, then

$$c(u, \widetilde{X}) = \frac{1+\alpha+\gamma/2}{2} \sum_{v:|v-u|=1} (1-\widetilde{X}(v)) + \frac{\gamma}{4} \sum_{v:|v-u|=1} (1-\widetilde{X}(v)) \sum_{\substack{w:|w-v|=1 \\ w\neq u}} \widetilde{X}(w).$$

These resemble the transition rates of a cVMBC with selection rate $\alpha + \frac{\gamma}{2}$ and cooperation rate $\frac{\gamma}{2}$, see also equations (2.5) and (2.6). In particular, clustering in the case $\gamma > \alpha = 0$ follows from Theorem 1 (iii). □

6.3 Proof of Theorem 3

At time t, let N_t be the number of finite clusters in X_t with sizes $C_t^1, ..., C_t^{N_t}$. If the process starts with finitely many defectors (cooperators), $C_t^1, C_t^3, C_t^5, ...$ are sizes of clusters of defectors (cooperators), and $C_t^2, C_t^4, ...$ are sizes of clusters of cooperators (defectors). Note that $(N_t, C_t^1, ..., C_t^{N_t})_{t\geq 0}$ is a Markov process. We will show the following:

1. Either, $N_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0$ or $N_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 1$.
2. In cases (ii) and (iii), $N_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0$.
3. If $N_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 1$, then $C_t^1 \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} \infty$.

Note that 1. and 3. together imply (i), i.e. X clusters in all cases. Of course, 2. implies (ii) and (iii).

1. The process $N = (N_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is non-increasing and bounded from below by 0, so convergence of N is certain. We assume that $N_0 = n \geq 3$. Note that N_0 is odd and remains so until it hits 1 from where it may or may not jump to 0. In order to prove the claim we show that the hitting time $\inf\{s : N_s < n\}$ is finite almost surely. For this, it suffices to show that

$$T := \inf\{s : C_s^k = 1 \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq N_s\} < \infty \tag{6.5}$$

almost surely, since by time T, some cluster has size 1 and there is a positive chance that N decreases at the next transition. If N does not decrease, there is the next chance after another finite time and eventually, N will decrease.

If $\alpha \geq \gamma$, consider the size C_t of a cluster of cooperators. Before time T, all clusters have size at least 2, so C_t jumps

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{from } C \text{ to } C+1 \text{ at rate } 1+\gamma, \\ &\text{from } C \text{ to } C-1 \text{ at rate } 1+\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

hence $(C_{t\wedge T})_{t\geq 0}$ is dominated by a symmetric random walk with jump rate $1+\alpha$, stopped when hitting 1, which implies that $T < \infty$ almost surely due to the recurrence of the symmetric random walk in one dimension. If $\gamma \geq \alpha$, the same argument shows that $T < \infty$ if the role of cooperators and defectors is exchanged. Hence we have proved (6.5) and 1. is shown.

2. If $N_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 1$ and $\alpha \geq \gamma$, the remaining finite cluster must consist of defectors (since the argument used in 1. shows that a finite cluster of cooperators would die out). Therefore, in case (ii), we must have that $N_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0$. If $\gamma \geq \alpha$, the remaining finite cluster consists of

cooperators for the same reason. Hence, in (iii), we must have that $N_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0$. Thus, we have shown 2.

3. As just argued in 1. and 2. if $N_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 1$ the remaining finite cluster must contain the stronger type, i.e. defectors for $\alpha > \gamma$ and cooperators for $\gamma > \alpha$. The size of the remaining finite cluster therefore is a biased random walk which goes to infinity on $\{N_t \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 1\}$ and the result follows. □

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank two anonymous referees for thorough reading and useful comments which improved the manuscript. This research was supported by the DFG through grant Pf-672/5-1.

References

[AS12] M. Archetti and I. Scheuring. *Review: Game theory of public goods in one-shot social dilemmas without assortment.* Journal of Theoretical Biology, Vol. 299 (2012), 9–20.

[BK11] J. Blath and N. Kurt. *Survival and extinction of caring double-branching annihilating random walk.* Electron. Commun. Probab. 16 (2011), no. 26, 271–282.

[BG81] M. Bramson and D. Griffeath. *On the Williams-Bjerknes Tumour Growth Model I.* Ann. Probab. 9 (1981), no. 2, 173–185.

[BBRG08] M. A. Brockhurst, A. Buckling, D. Racey and A. Gardner. *Resource supply and the evolution of public-goods cooperation in bacteria.* BMC Biology 6:20 (2008).

[Clu09] T. Clutton-Brock. *Cooperation between non-kin in animal societies.* Nature 462 (2009), no. 7269, 51–57.

[Cre01] B. J. Crespi. *The evolution of social behavior in microorganisms.* Trends in Ecology & Evolution, Vol. 16 (2001), no.4, 178–183.

[Czu16] P. Czuppon. *Phenotypic heterogeneity in bacterial populations – a mathematical study.* University of Freiburg, Dissertation (2016), DOI: 10.6094/UNIFR/11207.

[DNSWB14] K. Drescher, C. D. Nadell, H. A. Stone, N. S. Wingreen and B. L. Bassler. *Solutions to the Public Good Dilemma in Bacterial Biofilms.* Current Biology 24 (2014), no. 1, 50–55.

[EK86] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov processes. Characterization and convergence.* Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1986.

[EL16] S. Evilsizor and N. Lanchier. *Evolutionary games on the lattice: death-birth updating process.* Electron. J. Probab. 21 (2016), paper no. 17, 1–29.

[GW03] A. S. Griffin and S. A. West. *Kin Discrimination and the Benefit of Helping in Cooperatively Breeding Vertebrates.* Science 302 (2003), no. 5645, 634–636.

[HJM15+] M. Hutzenthaler, F. Jordan, D. Metzler. *Altruistic defense traits in structured populations.* arXiv:1505.02154, Mathematics - Probability, 2015.

[Lig85] T. M. Liggett. *Interacting Particle Systems.* Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1985.

[LTV14] O. Louidor, R. Tessler, A. Vandenberg-Rodes. *The Williams–Bjerknes model on regular trees.* Ann. Appl. Probab. 24 (2014), no. 5, 1889–1917.

[Now06] M. Nowak. *Five Rules for the Evolution of Cooperation.* Science 314 (2006), no. 5805, 1560–1563.

[PF10] D. J. Penn and J. G. Frommen. *Kin recognition: an overview of conceptual issues, mechanisms and evolutionary theory.* Animal Behaviour: Evolution and Mechanisms, Chapter 3. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010.

[SS15] A. Sturm and J. M. Swart. *A particle system with cooperative branching and coalescence.* Ann. Appl. Probab. 25 (2015), no. 3, 1616–1649.

[WB71] T. Williams and R. Bjerknes. *Stochastic model for abnormal clone spread through epithelial basal layer.* Nature 236 (1972), no. 5340, 19–21.

[WL06] N. S. Wingreen and S. A. Levin. *Cooperation among Microorganisms.* PLoS Biology 4 (2006), no. 9, e299.